

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMER United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,764	09/10/2003	Norman B. Javitt	1049-1-032N	4851
23565 7590 05/11/2007 KLAUBER & JACKSON		, ·	EXAMINER	
411 HACKEN	SACK AVENUE	·	MAKAR, KIMBERLY A	
HACKENSACK, NJ 07601			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			1636 ·	
			•	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		•	05/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/659,764	JAVITT, NORMAN B.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Kimberly A. Makar, Ph.D.	1636		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence address		
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANS IN THE MAILING DANS IN THE MAILING DANS IN THE MAILING DANS IN THE MONTHS FROM THE MAILING DANS IN THE MONTHS FROM THE MAILING DANS IN THE MONTH IN THE	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. (D) (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
2a) <u></u>	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 Fee This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Dispositi	on of Claims				
5)□ 6)□ 7)□ 8)⊠	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-15 and 18-20 is/are Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) 16-17 are subject to restriction and/or on Papers	e withdrawn from consideration.			
	•	,			
10)□	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction to the oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 2.	epted or b) objected to by the liderawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is object.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
2) D Notic 3) D Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate		

Application/Control Number: 10/659,764 Page 2

Art Unit: 1636

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's election of group IV in the reply filed on 2/22/07 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

- 2. Claims 1-15, 18-20 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 02/22/07.
- 3. However, in consideration of the restriction requirement resulting in group IV, drawn to two distinct methodologies, a second restriction requirement under 35 U.S.C. 121 is deemed necessary.

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - Claims 16, drawn to a method for identifying agent compounds capable of inhibiting 27-hydroxy-7-dehydrocholesterol reductase activity by measuring enzyme activity, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.
 - II. Claim 17, drawn to a method for identifying agents capable of interfering with the expression of 27-hydroxy-7dehydrocholesterol reductase activity by measuring RNA expression, classified in class 436, subclass 94.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Art Unit: 1636

2. Inventions I and II are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed differ in design and scope. The methods of group I, drawn to a method for identifying agent compounds capable of inhibiting 27-hydroxy-7dehydrocholesterol reductase activity by measuring enzyme activity is distinct from the methods of group II, drawn to a method for identifying agents capable of interfering with the expression of 27-hydroxy-7dehydrocholesterol reductase activity by measuring RNA expression analyzes the activity level of the enzyme 27-hydroxy-7-dehydrocholesterol reductase in the presence of an inhibitor, whereas, the method of group II, measures the expression level of the enzyme in the presence of an inhibitor. The method steps, reagents and results for analyzing enzyme activity differ greatly than the quantification of mRNA levels. An inhibitor that only acts on the activity of the enzyme may not interfere with the expression of that enzyme, thus the mRNA levels would not be affected. A search for a method of analyzing enzyme activity would not be co-extensive with a search for methods for determining mRNA levels, and therefore require additional burdensome searches. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

Art Unit: 1636

- 3. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 4. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions

Application/Control Number: 10/659,764

Art Unit: 1636

Page 5

unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimberly A. Makar, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-4139. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Woitach, Ph.D. can be reached on (571) 272-0739. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kam/04/30/07

JOSEPH WOITACH, PH.D. SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER